

### Remarks

This is responsive to the Advisory Action mailed on April 18, 2007. Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 6-12 have been previously withdrawn from consideration.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner entered the Rule 131 Declaration submitted with an Amendment After Final Rejection filed on March 29, 2007. The Examiner stated that Exhibit A in the Rule 131 Declaration failed to show that the inventors possessed the invention prior to January 24, 2002, because the document has no date.

The undersigned attorney initiated an interview with Examiner Ngo to discuss the comments in the Advisory Action. In a telephone conference on April 25, 2007, Examiner Ngo and the undersigned attorney discussed the Advisory Action and Exhibit A. Based on that discussion, Examiner Ngo invited Applicants to file this Response to the Advisory Action and reference the section in the MPEP that states an applicant may remove the dates on exhibits submitted with a Rule 131 declaration. Applicants and their undersigned attorney thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview.

Applicants submit that Exhibit A is acceptable and does not need to include any dates. In a Rule 131 Declaration, the dates of the exhibits may be removed or blocked off and the matter of dates may be taken care of in the body of the oath or declaration. (MPEP § 715.07(II).) The MPEP further states that to allege that conception or reduction to practice occurred prior to the effective date of a reference, "if the applicant or patent owner does not desire to disclose his or her actual dates, he or she may merely allege that the acts referred to occurred prior to a specified date." (Id.) In accordance with MPEP § 715.07(II), the Declarations of Gustav Fagrenius and Fredrik Palmqvist indicate that Exhibit A is a date-redacted copy and allege that the relevant portions of Exhibit A predate January 24, 2002.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Exhibit A is acceptable.

In view of the above discussion and the discussion in the Amendment After Final filed on March 29, 2007, Applicants submit that Seidler is not a prior art reference to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Attached for the Examiner's convenience are copies of the Declarations and Exhibit A submitted with the After Final Amendment filed on March 29, 2007.

instant application and respectfully request that the rejection based on Seidler be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of this Response. In view of the remarks and attached documents, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event any fees are due in connection with the filing of this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988 under Attorney Docket No. **SZACP0102US**.

Respectfully submitted,  
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By: /Scott M. Slaby/  
Scott M. Slaby, Reg. No. 53,603  
1621 Euclid Avenue  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2191  
(216) 621-1113

Attachments: Copy of Declarations and Exhibit A